

REMARKS IN RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION:

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 1-7.

Claims 7-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that claims 7, 24, 26, 31, 48, and 50 contain the phrases “a prescribed integral number M of contiguous ones of said data segments” and “a plurality of N in number of contiguous ones of said data segments,” and that it is unclear how the claims define the number of data frame headers, rendering the claims vague and indefinite. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 7-54 in view of the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit that the definition of the data frames, including the number of contiguous data segments and the number of contiguous data frame headers is clear and definite from the present language of claims 7, 24, 26, 31, 48, and 50. As an example, the table below breaks down the relevant language of claim 7 to demonstrate this point:

RELEVANT CLAIM 7 LANGUAGE
“said baseband signal composed of consecutive data segments”
“said consecutive data segments being divided into contiguous data frames”
“each [contiguous data frame] consisting of a prescribed integral number M of . . . said data segments”
“each said data frame characterized by beginning with a data frame header including a plurality of N in number of . . . said data segments”
“each said data frame . . . concluding with a plurality (M-N) in number of said data segments . . . used for transmitting data”

From this claim language, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would know the following:

1. Each baseband signal is divided into contiguous data frames;
2. Each data frame consists of M contiguous data segments;
3. Each data frame begins with a data frame header consisting of N contiguous data segments; and
4. Therefore, the number of data segments per data frame that transmits data is M minus N (M-N).

Applicants believe that claims 7, 24, 26, 31, 48, and 50 cannot be made any clearer than is presently presented. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 7-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 24 and 48 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly being indefinite because the claim term “PN sequence” is undefined. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection in view of the following remarks. The term “PN sequence” is used throughout the present specification in reference to “pseudo-noise” sequences. Although not explicitly defined (as was several other acronyms used in the specification), Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would ascertain this meaning by reading the specification at page 4, ll. 20-23 that discusses the 511-sample pseudo-random noise sequence referred to as “PN511 signal” and 63-sample pseudo-random noise sequence referred to as “PN63 signal.” One of ordinary skill in the art could also ascertain this meaning by reading the specification at page 25, ll. 26-28 that discusses the pseudo-random noise pair-sequence or “PNP sequence.”

Applicants believe that claims 24 and 48 cannot be made any clearer than is presently presented. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 24 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Serial No.: 09/700,448

Confirmation No.: 3754

Applicants: Allen LeRoy Limberg and Chandrakant B. Patel
Atty. Ref.: 12458.0091.NPUS00

* * * * *

Applicants believe that the present pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of the pending claims in light of the above remarks.

* * * * *

In order to facilitate the resolution of any questions presented by this paper, Applicants request that the Examiner directly contact the undersigned attorney by telephone at 713-787-1496 to further the discussion, reconsideration, and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey J. Phillips
Reg. No. 51,125
Customer No. 23369

Howrey LLP
2941 Fairview Park Drive, Box 7
Falls Church, VA 22042
Phone: (713) 787-1558
Fax: (703) 336-6950

9/21, 2005